

### **III. REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9 are pending in this application. No claims have been amended. The listing of claims is provided for the Examiner's convenience. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed.

Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weissman (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0156905), hereinafter "Weissman".

Applicants have reviewed the Office Action in its entirety and the cited art (Weissman) which is alleged to anticipate the claimed invention and respectfully disagree with the Office. As a general position, as with the previous Final Office Action and Advisory Action, Applicants do not find in the instant Office Action enough specific detail to allow the Applicants to determine what specific features in Weissman allegedly teach the numerous features in the claimed invention. Instead Applicants find in the Office Action numerous paragraphs cited from Weissman and a brief phrase or word(s) by the Office for supporting the rejection of various clauses in the claims. For example, in supporting its rejection of the following clause in claim 1: "transmission from said proxy to a Single Sign On (SSO) server of said user request together with credentials associated with said user, wherein said SSO server is external to and accessible via the

Internet to said HTTP proxy,” the Office merely states “(Weissman, paragraph 22, single sign-on, paragraph 25 authentication, 26, URL, domain)”. Office Action, page 3. The Office has not met its statutory burden of proving a *prima facie* case of anticipation. As such, Applicants request the Examiner cite with particularity what elements and features in Weissman teach each and every element of the claimed invention and where those elements/features can be found in Weissman.

In any event, with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Weissman fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, as is required under 102(b). For example, Weissman does not teach, *inter alia*, “wherein said SSO server is external to and accessible via the Internet to said HTTP proxy.” (*See e.g.*, claims 1 and 7). That is, based on the rejection, Applicants fail to see how Weissman teaches, *inter alia*, a separate HTTP proxy and SSO server.

In the Office Action, the Office alleges that “paragraph 22, HTTP GET” (sic) of Weissman teaches the claimed feature “receiving a user request from a user for Internet resources at an HTTP proxy.” Office Action, page 3. Applicants presume that based on, in particular, paragraph 22, lines 15-17, which state, “[w]hen a user selects one of the lines 102-104, the client computer sends a message (e.g., HTTP-get message) to the portal web site”, that the Office is alleging that the portal web site 320 (see e.g., Figure 3) in Weissman teaches the HTTP proxy of the claimed invention. Based on the Office’s allegation, Weissman cannot then also teach, *inter alia*, “transmission **from said proxy to a Single Sign On (SSO) server.**” (emphasis added) The Office also cites

paragraph 22 for support of the single sign on server. Office Action, page 3. Thus, assuming *arguendo* that Weissman at paragraph 22 teaches a HTTP proxy, it clearly does not teach both a HTTP proxy and a SSO server with transmission of information there between. There is no teaching of, *inter alia*, the distributed elements as in the claimed invention whatsoever.

In view of the foregoing, Weissman does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. Applicants further submit that independent claim 7 is allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to dependent claims 3-5 and 9, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2008

/Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian  
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044